UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,026	10/17/2003	Masato Arai	16869P-097900US	2167

20350 7590 11/16/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2136	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
11/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/688,026	ARAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David G. Cervetti	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 5, 2007, have been fully considered.

2. Claims 1-10 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Amendment

3. Regarding Applicant's argument against the Shah reference, Exmainer respectfully submits that the prior art reference is capable of performing as claimed, therefore it anticipates the claim. Shah associates users, objects, and resources for performing policy enforcement, what subset of resources (objects) and users (subjects) are associated is irrelevant, since Shah already teaches associating the plurality of entities (objects, subjects, users, programs, devices) to perform access policy functions. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

- claims 1-4 would be allowable;
- regarding independent claims 1 and 3, the prior art of record neither alone nor in combination teach
- "a policy creation unit for creating a draft policy based on said sample policy, said association information, and said differences detected by said differential detection unit; and a user interface unit for presenting said draft policy to the user, revising said draft policy as directed by the user, and saving the revised policy as the final policy" in combination with the other limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 3;

- claims 2 and 4 are allowed because of their dependence from independent claims 1 and 3.

5. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shah et al. (US Patent 6,678,835, hereinafter Shah).

Regarding claim 5, Shah teaches

- a policy setting support tool for creating, in a computer system equipped with an access control unit that controls access to computer-managed resources based on policies, said policy setting support tool comprising **(abstract)**:
- an information database holding, for each object of access, association information representing subjects that are used as a unit of access to the object **(col. 6, lines 13-42)**, and
- a unit for creating a policy from the association information held in said information database **(col. 7, lines 45-65)**.

Regarding claim 6, Shah teaches a subject-specifying unit for specifying unit of access to the object according to its purpose **(Shah, col. 6, lines 12-42)**, and a unit for creating said policy while designating the program specified by said subject-specifying unit as the subject that is permitted to access multiple kinds of object that are included in the association information **(Shah, col. 7, lines 45-65)**.

Regarding claim 7, Shah teaches wherein said computer system includes a collection of identifications of the subjects equipped with an object-sharing handling unit for sharing objects that are included in the association information among multiple subjects and a collection of object-sharing information listing the types of object that can be accessed by each subject, said policy setting support tool further comprising a unit for creating a policy that permits all or some of the types of access from a subject registered in said collection of object-sharing information to objects available to said subject **(Shah, col. 6, lines 12-42, col. 7, lines 45-65, col. 9, lines 1-67)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah, and further in view of Heintz et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2006/0010492, hereinafter Heintz).

Regarding claim 8, Shah does not expressly disclose notifying violations and modifying the policy accordingly.

However, Heintz teaches a unit for being notified by said access control unit of any access attempts violating said policy, for notifying the user of said computer system administering objects to be accessed about said access attempts with reason for violating the policy, and for carrying out a process based on a judgment made by said user in response to the notification, wherein: said judgment made by said user is a choice between thereafter permitting all of said access attempts violating said policy, permitting said access attempt only this time, and prohibiting all of said access attempts violating said policy; in case said judgment made by said user is to thereafter permit all of said access attempts violating said policy, said process is to revise said policy so as to make said access attempts legitimate and to notify said access control unit of the legitimacy of said access attempts; in case said judgment made by said user is to permit said access attempt only this time, said process is to notify said access control unit of the legitimacy of said access attempt, without revising said policy; and in case said judgment made by said user is to prohibit all of said access attempts violating said policy, said process is to notify said access control unit of the illegitimacy of said access attempts, without revising said policy **(abstract)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shah to include raising alerts when specific events occurred. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide for a faster response to events and enforce security policies **(Heintz, paragraphs 6-8)**.

Regarding claim 9, Shah does not expressly disclose notifying violations and modifying the policy accordingly.

However, Heintz teaches a unit for being notified by said access control unit of any access attempts to an object not registered in the collection of said policies coming from a subject associated with said object, for notifying the user of said computer system about said access attempts, and for carrying out a process based on a judgment made by said user in response to the notification, wherein: said judgment made by said user is a choice between permitting and prohibiting said access attempt made to said object not registered in the collection of said policies coming from a subject associated with said object; in case said judgment made by said user is to permit said access attempt, said process is to revise said policy so as to make said access attempt legitimate and to notify said access control unit of the legitimacy of said access attempt; and in case said judgment made by said user is to prohibit said access attempt, said process is to notify said access control unit of the illegitimacy of said access attempt, without revising said policy **(abstract)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shah to include raising alerts when specific events occurred. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide for a faster response to events and enforce security policies **(Heintz, paragraphs 6-8)**.

Regarding claim 10, Shah does not expressly disclose notifying violations and modifying the policy accordingly.

However, Heintz teaches a unit for being notified by said access control unit of any access attempts coming from a subject which only partially matches the collection of said policies, for notifying the user of said computer system about said access attempts, and for carrying out a process based on a judgment made by said user in response to the notification, wherein: said judgment made by said user is a choice between permitting and prohibiting said access attempt made by said subject; in case said judgment made by said user is to permit said access attempt, said process is to revise said policy so as to make said access attempt legitimate and to notify said access control unit of the legitimacy of said access attempt; and in case said judgment made by said user is to prohibit said access attempt, said process is to notify said access control unit of the illegitimacy of said access attempt, without revising said policy **(abstract)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shah to include raising alerts when specific events occurred. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide for a faster response to events and enforce security policies **(Heintz, paragraphs 6-8)**.

Conclusion

10. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Venkatesan (NPL Threat-Adaptive Security Policy) teaches keeping history of user accesses and adapting policy according to changes in the usage pattern. Moriconi (US Patent 6,158,010 and 6,941,472) teaches creating/editing/updating policies. Attwood (US Patent 6,347,376) teaches dynamic rules of a security policy. Proctor (US Patent 6,530,024) teaches adaptive security policies that are updated based on behavior analyzed from event log files that trigger policy updates

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/

KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER